

### **REMARKS**

Claims 16-43, 45-47, and 55-56 were pending on the October 8, 2008 mailing date of the final Official Action. Claims 23-43, 45-47, and 55-56 are being cancelled. Claims 16-22 are being amended. Claims 57- 70 are being added. Support for the claim amendments and the new claims can be found in the specification at least on pages 33-41. Reconsideration of the action and further examination are respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

#### **Interview**

The Applicants thanks Examiner Wassum for the courtesy of an interview on December 19, 2008. During the interview various amendments were discussed as well as the prior art of record. All parties agreed that the interview aided the mutual understanding of the application and references, and generally advanced prosecution.

#### **§ 103 Rejections**

Claims 16-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,134,532 (Lazarus) in view of European Patent No. EP 0597630 (Addison) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,298,348 (Eldering). Claims 41-43, 45-47, and 55-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Addison in view of Eldering. Claims 23-43, 45-47, and 55-56 have been cancelled, therefore the rejection of these claims is moot.

Amended claim 23 recites “organizing advertisements according to their meaning into a lexicon, the lexicon defining elements of a semantic space; receiving a concept; determining one or more concepts close in meaning to the received concept; identifying one or more advertisements in the semantic space related to the received concept and the one or more concepts close in meaning to the received concept based on meanings of the received concept and the one or more concepts; and transmitting for display the one or more advertisements based on an order, the order corresponding to the relationship between monetary values determined for each of the one or more advertisements identified as related to the received concept and the one or more concepts close in meaning to the received concept.”

In general, Addison is directed to building a concept index from a semantic network of

word relationships. See pg. 5, ll. 45-49. Lazarus is generally directed to a system for delivering targeted entities, such as advertising, coupons, products and informational content, or users based on their observed behavior. See Col. 4, ll. 56-59. Eldering is generally directed to profiling consumers and providing access to the consumer profile in a secure manner. See Col. 2, ll. 26-30. Applicants respectfully assert that none of the relied upon portions of these references teach or suggest “organizing advertisements according to their meaning into a lexicon, the lexicon defining elements of a semantic space; receiving a concept; determining one or more concepts close in meaning to the received concept; identifying one or more advertisements in the semantic space related to the received concept and the one or more concepts close in meaning to the received concept based on meanings of the received concept and the one or more concepts; and transmitting for display the one or more advertisements based on an order, the order corresponding to the relationship between monetary values determined for each of the one or more advertisements identified as related to the received concept and the one or more concepts close in meaning to the received concept,” as recited in claim 16. Claims 17-22 depend from claim 16 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 16.

New claim 57 recites “organizing advertisements according to their meaning into a lexicon, the lexicon defining elements of a semantic space; receiving an input term; identifying a first point in the semantic space associated with the input term based on an interpretation of potential meanings of the input term; determining a first semantic sub-space that includes all of the elements of the semantic space within a predetermined radius of the first point; identifying, in the first semantic sub-space, an advertisement proximate in semantic distance to the search term, wherein the semantic distance identifies how closely related the advertisement is to the search term; and providing the advertisement in response to the search term.” Claim 57 is allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 16. Claims 58-63 depend from claim 57 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 57.

New claim 64 is directed to a system comprising organizing advertisements according to their meaning into a lexicon, the lexicon defining elements of a semantic space; receiving an input term; identifying a first point in the semantic space associated with the input term based on

an interpretation of potential meanings of the input term; determining a first semantic sub-space that includes all of the elements of the semantic space within a predetermined radius of the first point; identifying, in the first semantic sub-space, an advertisement proximate in semantic distance to the search term, wherein the semantic distance identifies how closely related the advertisement is to the search term; and providing the advertisement in response to the search term. Claim 64 is allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 16. Claims 65-70 depend from claim 64 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 64.

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicants submit that all the claims are in condition for allowance. By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the Examiner, the Applicants do not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the Applicants' selecting some particular arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, the Applicants' decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the Applicants agree with any positions taken by the Examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any charges not otherwise paid or any credits to deposit account 06 1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 31, 2008

/Leila R. Abdi/

Leila R. Abdi

Reg. No. 52,399

Customer No. 26192  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
Telephone: (404) 892-5005  
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945